REMARKS

Claims 1-10 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

The replacement drawing sheet containing Fig. 1 now corrects the vertical arrows extending from elements 5 and 6. The vertical arrows should correctly point toward the elements 5 and 6 and not away from them. The size values set by the user are input to the elements 5 and 6, as shown in the vertical arrow extending to element 7.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 9, and 10 have been amended to further improve their clarity, as well as to remove minor informalities contained therein. In this respect, the present amendment now clarifies the setting feature of setting, according to input by a user, display sizes of the music score notational elements to be displayed on the display area (as opposed to determining the display sizes). See the first full paragraph (in particular the second from the last sentence) of page 11 and the second paragraph of page 13, and Fig. 1 of the present disclosure. Moreover, the present amendment also clarifies calculating, based on the set display sizes, a minimum horizontal length of each of the measures necessary for placing in each of the measures at least one kind of the music score notational elements without an overlap in a horizontal direction. No new matter has been introduced.

Request for Another Interview

It appears that another interview is needed to assist the examiner to better understand what the claimed invention calls for. As explained below, the applied reference Tice (USP 6,751,439) has nothing to do with apportioning the measures based on the calculated horizontal length of each of the measures as set forth in the independent claims. The undersigned will contact the examiner to schedule an interview in due course. The examiner, however, is urged to contact the undersigned if the examiner intends to act on this case before an interview is scheduled.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tice. In the last reply and during the previous interview, applicant explained to the examiner that the previously applied reference, namely Matsumoto, would not have disclosed or taught the calculating and apportioning features. The examiner agrees, but now relies on Tice's Figs. 9E and 15 to reject the claims. Applicant requests the examiner to reconsider based on the following reasons.

The independent claims now clearly define setting, based on the user's input, the sizes of the music score notational elements to be displayed on the display area. In this respect, the claimed invention allows the user to designate the display sizes of the music score notational elements, which allows the user to predict how the notational elements would appear on the screen. Furthermore, where the display sizes of the music score notational elements are selectable among a number of candidates, fine adjustments of the displayed images of the notational elements are now possible in terms of the element size. Still further, the sizes of the music score notational elements can be changed with the number of measures displayed on the screen unchanged so that the legibility (density or symbol/space ratio) of the music score can be advantageously controlled.

Tice discloses an interactive on-line training system for teaching music to students. The system mainly comprises a student station 12, an administrative web server 14, a teacher station 16, and a communications network 18. See column 3, lines 60- 65, and Fig. 1. The student station 12 has a training program (MUSIC COURSE) and a MIDI sequencer program (EVALUATION SEQUENCER) 56. See column 6, lines 36 - 42. Figs. 9A - 9I illustrate sample screens displayed on the student station 12 when the EVALUATION SEQUENCER 56 is running. While one staff tier of music score is displayed on the screen as shown in Fig. 9D, pressing the SCORE VIEW button 506 reveals the entire score consisting of three staff tiers as shown in Fig. 9E. Figs. 9A-9I also show a ZOOM IN button 500 and a ZOOM OUT button 502, which has a conventional zooming feature for changing the view size. See column 13, lines 23 - 29 and Figs. 9A-9B. Fig. 14 shows a flowchart of an OPEN SONG routine 576 up to a TURN PACKETS TO NOTE routine 592 executed by the sequencer to display the screen images. See column 15, lines 26 - 47.

Fig. 15 illustrates the TURN PACKETS TO NOTES routine, which calculates the note **duration** length and the note is inserted into the current measure. See column 15, lines 64 -65. But the calculated note duration length is not used for controlling the size of the music score notational element. Indeed, Tice's Fig. 15 has nothing to do with calculating or adjusting the length of any measure. Rather, it merely discloses determining whether the notes belong to the current measure or the next measure.

Moreover, Tice appears to use fixed equal sized measures as illustrated in Fig. 9E. In this respect, Tice is not at all concerned at all with calculating or apportioning the measures. Moreover, because Tice's measures each appear to have a fixed predetermined length, there is no reason to vary the length of any measure.

Moreover, Tice's ZOOM IN button 500 and ZOOM OUT button 502 can only vary the overall view size of the music score on the screen. See Figs. 9A and 9B. These buttons cannot be used to adjust the size of the individual notational elements without effecting the size of other notational elements in other measures or changing the number of measures displayed on the screen.

Applicant submits that Tice fails to disclose or teach at least (1) setting the sizes of the music score notational elements to be displayed according to the designation by the user, (2) calculating the minimum horizontal length of each measure based on the set display sizes of the music score notational elements, and (3) apportioning the measures to fit the last full displayed measure in each tier, as set forth in the independent claims.

<div align="center">Conclusion</div>

Applicant submits that claims 1-10 patentably distinguish over the applied reference and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

10 JULY 2009   /Lyle Kimms/
DATE   LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

                                20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150
                                ASHBURN, VA 20147
                                703-726-6020 (PHONE)
                                703-726-6024 (FAX)